

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-24 are pending in the present application after this amendment cancels claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 and adds new claims 21-24. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended to include the features of canceled claims 2, 7, 12, and 17, respectively, and claims 21-24 include the features of unamended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 and the features of claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, respectively. No new matter is added. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,653 to Takahara et al. (hereinafter referred to as Takahara) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,489,941 to Inage et al. (hereinafter referred to as Inage). Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Inage and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0171613 to Goto et al. (hereinafter referred to as Goto). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner admits the Takahara does not disclose a resetting means as recited in the claims. The Examiner asserts that Inage at column 5, lines 2-21, discloses a resetting means as recited in the claims. The cited section does not provide support for a resetting means, and Applicant respectfully submits that the citation may more appropriately be to column 6, lines 2-21. Clarification from the Examiner is requested by the Applicant in the next Office communication. The Examiner further asserts that it would be obvious to combine Takahara and the resetting means apparently disclosed in Inage for the purpose of shortening the response time of the LCD device. (Office Action; page 3, lines 16-19; citing Inage; col. 4, lines 50-60).

However, the motivation to combine Inage and Takahara presented by the Examiner merely states an advantage claimed by Inage based on a citation to Inage. Therefore, the Office

Action does not present any specific motivation why a person skilled in the art, and aware of Inage would be motivated to combine the teachings therein with Takahara. Likewise, there is no citation to Takahara presenting any motivation to combine the teachings therein with Inage. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine the references, and therefore the rejection based on the combination of the references is improper.

However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended to include the features of canceled claims 2, 7, 12, and 17, respectively. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections based on Takahara and Inage are obviated, and these claims and their dependent claims are discussed in regard to the rejection based on Takahara, Inage, and Goto. Amended claims 1 and 11 now include the feature of the resetting means performing its resetting operation with reference to a latch signal supplied to the source driver circuit by the controller circuit. Likewise, claims 6 and 16 now include the feature of the polarity inverting means performing its polarity-inverting operation with reference to a latch signal and a polarity-inverting signal, which are supplied to the source driver circuit by the controller circuit.

The Examiner admits that neither Takahara nor Inage disclose or suggest a latch signal associated with the resetting process. (Office Action; page 5, lines 3-4). The Examiner asserts that these features are disclosed in Goto, and that the motivation to combine the references is to ensure high speed performance. (Office Action; page 5, lines 5-10; citing Goto; paragraph 20). However, the motivation to combine the references is insufficient for the same reason as presented above with regard to the Takahara and Inage references, namely, there is no suggestion presented in any of the references that would motivate a practitioner in the art to look to the *other references* to solve *a specific problem*. The citation in Goto to paragraph 20 merely

discloses a purported advantage of Goto, and does not provide any objective motivation to combine the reference with Takahara or Inage.

Additionally, Goto does not disclose or suggest the feature of *resetting means performing a resetting operation with reference to a latch signal supplied to a source driver circuit by a controller circuit*, as recited in claims 1 and 11. The Office Action cites figure 5 and paragraph 125 of Goto as disclosing this feature. The description accompanying figure 5 (Goto; paragraphs 121-128) apparently only discloses a latch in regard to latching display data based on a control signal. (Goto; paragraph 125). There is no indication of *resetting* in any of the description of figure 5 in Goto, and therefore Goto does not disclose or suggest *using a latch signal as a reference in a resetting operation*. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claims 13-15 depend from claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 is allowable.

Similarly, Goto does not disclose or suggest the feature of *a polarity inverting means performing a polarity-inverting operation with reference to a latch signal and a polarity-inverting signal, which are supplied to a source driver circuit by a controller circuit*, as recited in claims 6 and 16. The description accompanying figure 5 in Goto mentions polarity with respect to a positive-polarity gray scale voltage generating circuit 151a (Goto; paragraph 122), and a negative-polarity gray scale voltage generating circuit 151b (Goto; paragraph 123). However, these circuits are not connected, and there is no suggestion of *a polarity inverting means* in figure 5 or a polarity inverting operation in the accompanying description. Since none of the reference disclose or suggest *a polarity inverting operation or a polarity inverting*

operation, the combination of the references, the propriety of which is respectfully not conceded, does not render claims 6 and 16 unpatentable. Therefore, claims 6 and 16 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6 is allowable. Claims 18-20 depend from claim 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16 is allowable.


New claims 21-24 include the features of unamended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 and the features of claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, respectively, and therefore these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed above relating to Inage not disclosing resetting means and the lack of motivation to combine Inage and Takahara. Additionally, these claims include the features of claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, namely, that the polarity of the data voltages supplied by way of the data lines is *alternately inverted in every set of the two horizontal synchronizing periods and in every vertical synchronizing period within every frame*, period, thereby driving the device by a 2-H dot inversion method. The Examiner asserts that Takahara at column 20, lines 46-51 and figures 14 and 15 discloses this feature. However, figures 14 and 15 and the accompanying description of Takahara apparently discloses a column-inversion drive (Takahara; col, 20, line 45), as contrasted with an H-inversion drive (Takahara; col, 20, line 43), as disclosed in figures 12 and 13 of Takahara. This disclosure in Takahara does not teach, or even suggest, a polarity inversion in every set of two horizontal synchronizing periods and in every vertical synchronizing period within every frame, as recited in the new claims. Figures 14 and 15 do not appear to show any inversion between horizontal lines at all, as each column shown in the figures has only one voltage throughout. Therefore, for at least this additional reason, claims 21-24 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Hennessey
Reg. No. 51,271

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8800
Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987
Docket No.: 100806-00219 (NECA 20.522)
BEH:pm